

Message

From: Jerry Campbell [JCampbell@ramboll.com]
Sent: 11/4/2019 7:44:13 PM
To: Schlosser, Paul [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=121cf759d94e4f08afde0ceb646e711b-Schlosser, Paul]
Subject: RE: Chloroprene PBPK: Peer review charge questions

Ok, that makes more sense. I like your sensitivity file. I started out similar to this but had an error that was driving me nuts. Stupid simple isn't always the simplest. This is the first sensitivity I've set up in R so it was bound to not be intuitive.

Jerry Campbell

Managing Consultant

D 919-765-8022
jcampbell@ramboll.com

Ramboll
3214 Charles B. Root Wynd
Suite 130
Raleigh, NC 27612
USA
<https://ramboll.com>

From: Schlosser, Paul <Schlosser.Paul@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 4, 2019 2:32 PM
To: Jerry Campbell <JCampbell@ramboll.com>
Subject: RE: Chloroprene PBPK: Peer review charge questions

"I'm fine with one file that is Fmouse_parms.R but you specifically did not like that format in the initial review where you wanted a single physiological parameter script for the species and sex specific parameters set separately. You are more attuned to how reviewer will run the model. "

What I'm doing has a single species param script for physiological params (that you created) and a single-sex specific script for the sex-specific params. You had sex-specific params in multiple places throughout the scripts, which is what I wanted to avoid. I just was asking that the phys params be set in a single script separate from the metabolic params, since those do not change between male and female mice/rats. ☺

-Paul